UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | - FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/721,225 | 11/26/2003 | Joern Luctzen | 2004 SP 00115 | 5694 | |
| 48154 SLATER & MA | 7590 05/17/2007 ATSH LLP | | EXAMINER | | |
| 17950 PRESTO | | | GOUDREAU, GEORGE A | | |
| SUITE 1000 DALLAS, TX 75252 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| DALLAS, TA | , | | 1763 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 05/17/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| , | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|--|---|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | 10/721,225 | LUETZEN ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | George A. Goudreau | 1763 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence addres | is | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirn rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | I. lely filed the mailing date of this commu (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Fe | ebruary 2007. | | 4 | | | |
| ·— · _ | action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar | | secution as to the me | rits is | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13 and 21-27</u> is/are <u>pending</u> in the a | application. | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13 and 21-27</u> is/are rejected. | · | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | • | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| The bath of declaration is objected to by the Ex | ammer. Note the attached Office | Action of format 10-1 | JZ. | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. △ Certified copies of the priority documents | s have been received. | | · | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior | | ed in this National Stag | је | | | |
| application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the second seco | | d | | | | |
| See the attached detailed Office action for a list of | or the certified copies not receive | 1 1 111412 11 11 | rudreau AU ER | | | |
| Attachment(s) | • | 5-071 | • | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summary | | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | | | | | |
| I.S. Patent and Trademark Office | i | | · · · | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/721,225

Art Unit: 1763

1. Claims 1-13, and 21-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

-In the claims, the usage of the term "large structure" is confusing. (i.e.-What constitutes being a large structure?);

-In the claims, the usage of the term "main trench structures" is confusing. (i.e.-What constitutes being a main trench structure?);

-In the claims, the usage of the term "area-selective etching" is confusing. (i.e.-What constitutes being an area-selective etching process?);

-The wording used throughout claims 1, and 21 is written in a very confusing manner, and should be reworded. (i.e.-It is unclear how the opening in the etch mask are aligned relative to the difference crystal planes in the wafer which are etched. Applicant refers to a rectangular surface grid, and areas, which are formed in a checkered fashion relative to this grid. How do these structures relate to both the openings in the etch mask, and the different crystal planes in the wafer which are etched? In claim 1, see especially paragraphs 1, and 5 in this regard. In claim 21, see especially paragraphs 1, 3, and 5 in this regard.)

-The wording used in claims 2-3 is written in a very confusing manner, and should be reworded.;

-Claim 7 conflicts with claim 21 upon which it depends. (i.e.-Claim 7 recites the usage of oval openings in the etch mask while claim 21 appears to recite the usage of rectangular openings.);

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/721,225

Art Unit: 1763

- -The wording used in claim 9 is written in a very confusing manner, and should be reworded. (i.e.- What constitutes orienting a grid with a <100> crystal orientation?);
- -The wording used in claim 11 is written in a very confusing manner, and should be reworded.; and
- -Claim 27 conflicts with claim 1 upon which it depends. (i.e.-Claim 27 recites the usage of oval openings in the etch mask while claim 1 appears to recite the usage of rectangular openings.)
- 2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 3. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner George A. Goudreau at telephone number (571)-272-1434.

George A. Goudfeau Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1763